

September 2010, Tirana, Albania

Would Sumerian Language and Assyriology be a further possibility to Albanian historical linguistics and Albanology?

ANASTAS S. SHUKE
Scholar – Assyriology/Sumerology
Alb-Science Institute
Tirana, ALBANIA
anastas.shuke@gmail.com

Abstract

The study of Sumerian, of prime importance for knowing Sumerian civilization, despite of advancements, is “still at an imperfect stage, with fundamental questions yet to be resolved” (J.L.Hayes). To the contributions of comparative studies of ANE, Europe, Asia, and Africa languages, might also be attached Albanian.

The present work tries to provide historical and linguistic arguments which suggest comparison of Albanian to Sumerian and claims the attention of Albanian historical linguistics and Albanology. Initiating of a nucleus of Assyriology-Sumerology could be the beginning of Albanian contribution to Sumerology, and an inducement to historical Albanian.

Arguments include typological comparison: Albanian can have equal Ergativity as Sumerian; genitive/possessive with “-ak, e-” (Hayes, Halloran); Albanian Short-Form presence in Sumerian in the form of MP,CP,DP,PA affixes (Hayes); word order; etymological comparison of parallel terms from Epic of Creation in Sumerian, Akkadian, and Sanskrit, through English to Albanian; comparison of names for gods/planets, months, cities; also sentences; agglutinative division Sumerian-English-Albanian with repetition of certain nouns, verbs, accusative pronouns, adverbs, showing the agglutinativity of Sumerian through Albanian: a possibility for the classification of Sumerian; etymological reevaluations of Albanian by the help of Sumerian.

Between the references:

J.A.Halloran-(Sumerian Lexicon,2006); J.L.Hayes-(A Manual of Sumerian Grammar and Texts, 2000).

September 2011, Prishtina, Kosova

Would Albanian Language enable us a more exact reading of the Sumerian/Babylonian Epic of Creation?

Abstract

The Epic of Creation is between the most interesting and most studied documents through 140 years in the science of Assyriology-Sumerology. To the numerous efforts for the study and interpretation of that cosmogony might also help the Albanian language.

Through comparative etymological three-language analysis, Sumerian-English-Albanian, of the phonetic similarities of different terms/characters in the Epic of Creation, and their agglutinative-semantic division, these gods/planets names themselves might retell us the Epic.

The analysis of terms Ki, Tiamat/Kiamak, Rakia/Rakkis, Anshar, and gods/planets An/Shar/Nibiru/Marduk, confirmed by other scientific and historical data, might corroborate, linguistically, the speculations of Z. Sitchin on Epic of Creation. The analysis of the conclusion

of Falkenstein on the term Arrow/Life, of The Sumerian King List, and Steinkeller's work on Ninurta's Seal, is a direct argumentation of the contributions which might be given to Assyriology/Sumerology through Albanian language and interchangeably.

Key words: Sumer, Albanian, etymology, Tiamat, Ninurta, Epic of Creation.

September 2012, Macedonia

Would Albanian help us in the morphological reconstruction of cuneiform and Sumerian language?


The morphological reconstruction of Sumerian, as the process that follows its transliteration from cuneiform, continues to encounter numerous difficulties which result in lexical and grammatical discrepancies, uncertainty in the study and translation of this language. Albanian could help in establishing the rules of Sumerian morphological reconstruction, risen from the comparison of numerous lexical and grammatical elements they share, which are also supported and corroborated with linguistic continuity for some basic terms and symbols of the heraldry of Illyrians and Arbers.


The nowadays accepted basic rule is that the cuneiform script does not represent the lexical and grammatical elements of Sumerian in a one by one relationship, "making it very difficult to reconstruct the morphology" (Hayes, 2000). The eclectic changes of the sign order during translation, subjective choices of their logographic or syllabic values, and the absence of standard reading lists of cuneiform signs, reveal the numerous discrepancies and the necessity of establishing the rules of morphological reconstruction.



The analysis through Albanian of the term *ti/til* – life/arrow and its match with Falkenstein's known conclusions, the complex term "nindabu" (*ninda*), and other terms and sentences, tell us the existence of reading or morphological reconstruction rules of cuneiform script and Sumerian language, which can be established by the help of Albanian. Word formation role of the stabilizant "a". The rule of end consonants or vowels repeating on the next syllable. The rules of division and combination of logographic and syllabic values to get to word division during the morphological reconstruction of Sumerian.


Key words: Albanian, Sumerian, cuneiform, reconstruction, morphologic, word-formation


Falkenstein's TIL / TI – arrow / life

In 1936, the great sumerologist Adam Falkenstein studying the oldest Sumerian texts found in Jemdat-Nasr (and also those of Uruk IV/III, Urim, and Fara), arrived to the conclusion that got immediate acceptance by all Sumerologists of the world: "In the term *Enlil-ti*, which is often found in those texts, the bound syllabic reading "ti" of the cuneiform sign  shows

phonetization of the cuneiform script of Sumerian, from the archaic period 3000-2600BC, that the language where the term Enlil-ti occurs is Sumerian, and also that, the Language in which respective words for the sign  with logographic reading “arrow” and syllabic reading “ti = life”, are homophones, is the Language for which was created the Cuneiform script (Hayes,2000).” If we would analyse in Albanian language those words postulated by Falkenstein we would immediately see that they are homophones really, and they even have quite coherent etymologic-semantic relations:





The term for arrow = shigjetë - sh.ig.jetë - (a)sh.ik.jetë, includes semantically (and graphically in cuneiform) the term life = jetë and shows that the arrow makes the life go/leave, it removes the life. The form of the arrow sign , rotated to original position clockwise by 90°, represents the figure of a man  (a life) stroke by the arrow. By breaking the sign in pieces following its etymology in Albanian, we might get to the following:

 has the reading aš (ash) – meaning is = asht in Albanian

 = igi ≈ go/leave, is the removal of life by the arrow, ig/ik/iq/heq; (Alb. root of verb *sh+ik* 'to see'; sh=is + -ik=go/leave; eyes see a moving/going/leaving object only).

 = ti, translated life = jetë ≈ je.ti (you are /thou art)

So, in Albanian “jetë & shigjetë” are: a) homophones; b) Albanian can give for both of them a good agglutinative etymology; c) the actual Albanian word for arrow=shigjet can be divided in parts that match semantically the division of the cuneiform sign for arrow, in its three graphic components: (a)sh + ig + jet, meaning in English: is + go/leave + life; d) ti = (je) ti = jet, - in English: "you are the life" = (the life) is thou = je ti. Also: TIL = TI + L = Life(je.ti) + Leave(ig/ik). Because in Albanian: leave = ik or l(ë), and leave is near the meaning of remove=heq/eq (ig/ik/ek/eg), and life=je.t(i), then we have the same equation for the Albanian word arrow/shigjet = ash + ig + jet (supported by graphic division of the sign), which is equal to the Sumerian division of til = ti+l.

Conclusion:  =  +  +  = (a)sh + ig + jetë = shigjetë, and according to Falkenstein, Albanian might be, the written language, for which was invented the cuneiform script. Sumerian seems to be the primeval documentation of Albanian, arguments supporting this concept are ample and systematic.

Anastas Shuke

Indipendent scholar